



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

cept in having *Fourth Edition* and what is said of the map.

The first edition of the first volume was published April 25, 1719, and the fourth edition of the same volume August 8 of the same year, according to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 14, p. 288.

With reprints scattered through the country in which the title-pages said nothing of the place where Crusoe was wrecked, a false idea of the place might easily grow up in the United States if there was any strong influence tending to start and foster a false idea about it. An influence of that kind has been abroad ever since writers associated Crusoe with Selkirk. Selkirk's solitary life on Juan Fernandez is matter of history, and it has long been customary to speak of Selkirk as the original of Defoe's Crusoe. Naturally a sincere lover of Defoe's great masterpiece is inclined to resent an imputation that seems to derogate from the genius of its maker; but if there are any great masterpieces which are so wholly original that their inception did not come from an outside source, I do not know what and where those masterpieces are.

Selkirk's account of himself in *The Englishman*, Numb. xxvi (December 1-3, 1713), taken from his lips about five and a half years before Robinson Crusoe appeared, and what Selkirk said of his life on Juan Fernandez, as reported by Captain Woodes Rogers (1712), made him a public character who could hardly have been overlooked by such a man as Defoe, and certainly the details of these accounts suggest that he was Crusoe's original. Though Selkirk was not the only recluse who has been named for that high distinction, it is reasonable to believe that Defoe meditated on the possibilities of such a life as Selkirk's until *Robinson Crusoe* was achieved.

The only parts of Captain Rogers' *Journal* that I have seen were incomplete reprints. Number xxvi of *The Englishman*,—an original copy,—is in the Yale Library.

RALPH OLMSTED WILLIAMS.

New Haven, Conn.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

The Development of Standard English Speech in Outline. By J. M. HART. Pp. vii, 93. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1907.

Notwithstanding the larger treatises covering the subject, there was room for this little book, and the making of it has fallen into good hands. Professor Hart has an enviable reputation as an expert in English linguistics, and besides has the gift of clear and succinct expression. This gift is illustrated by the opening paragraph of his General Remarks, which also suggests the scope of the book:

'The history of the growth of modern English pronunciation is complicated. Certain features are puzzling; some are obscure and—even in the best light of our present knowledge—appear arbitrary. The chief features, however, admit of systematic explanation and can be mastered by all who will take the pains.'

The trenchant unconventionality which here and there appears will be refreshing to many readers. Here is a specimen (pp. v, vi):

'Next, in nearly all phonological discussions there is too much Ormulum; the work of Brother Orm is viewed as if it were the norm of twelfth-century speech. This is to overlook the patent fact that it represented only one small district. Lastly, I am more than puzzled by the air of confidence with which the German school block_g out mediæval England in squares like a check-board and assigns each bit of writing, from Layamon's Brut to the "Alliterative Poems," to its particular little square. I must confess to being deplorably deficient in this sense of the fourth dimension.'

Perhaps mathematical, no less than non-mathematical readers, will be 'more than puzzled' by this 'fourth dimension,' but the vigor of the writing will not be questioned.

The little book, which, according to its author, 'may be said to represent Cornell aim and method,' is well conceived, and, in the main, well executed. The strictures which it occurs to me to pass are few and comparatively slight, and are such as could easily be turned to account in a second edition, if it seemed to the author worth while.

In illustrating the interchange of *i* and *e* in ME., Professor Hart says (p. 34): 'In the *Ayenbite* (fourteenth century) the Mn. E. word *sin* is written *zenne* (initial *z* for *s* is Southern dialect).' Is not this to overlook the fact that the *Ayenbite* is the most typical representative of the Kentish dialect (Morsbach, *Mitteleng. Gram.*, p. 10), and that in this dialect OE. *y* (not *i*) regularly becomes *e* (Morsbach, pp. 164, 176)? In fact, *e* for *y* is a Kentish peculiarity in Old English itself (Sievers, § 154).

On p. 40 we seem to be told that Mod. Eng. *taught* comes from OE. *tāhte* through ME. *tā(u)hte*; in other words, that OE. *āht* becomes *āht* in ME. Is not this to overlook the fact that *tāhte* occurred in OE., along with *tēhte* (Sievers, § 407, note 11), and that ME. *tāhte* is usually explained as a shortening of the OE. form (Morsbach, p. 136)?

In commenting (pp. 13, 22) on the length of the vowel in OE. *dēofol*, ME. (Orm) *deofless*, *defless*, and its shortness in Mod. Eng. (or 'Mn. E.,' if any one prefers), Professor Hart ignores the Scotch and Northern English *deevil*, *deil*.

Professor Hart says (p. vii): '*G. T.* (General Teutonic) is a safer abbreviation than *Germ.* (Germanic), which might be mistaken for German.' But this would not apply to *Gmc.*, for which there is sufficient precedent. He properly employs the term 'Old English,' instead of 'Anglo-Saxon'; but why not 'OE.' (see *NED.*), instead of 'O. E.?' 'Umlauted' (p. 6), 'i-umlaut' (p. 69), ought to be generally approved. 'Diphthonging,' though an unlovely word, is not without authority, and is here commonly employed; but why then also 'diphthongization' (twice on p. 3)? 'In open syllable' (p. 32) may be justified as technical phraseology, but I should have preferred the insertion of 'an.'

Is Professor Hart a spelling reformer, or not? He writes 'rimes' (p. 12), but 'levelling' (p. 22, and elsewhere).

On p. 25 occurs 'designate it with the sign *ē*'; usage seems to be in favor of 'by.'

For the sound of *j* in *joke* the author employs *dʃ*, as 'the usual sign might be confounded with an O. E. *dg* (p. vii).' This seems hardly likely, and, in any case, *dʒh* might have been employed, in spite of its inconsistency with *tʃ*, rather than

to employ a symbol which, strictly regarded, is incorrect.

In general, Professor Hart seems to prefer to express the long diphthongs, *ēa*, *ēo*, *īe*, by extending the macron over both vowel-signs (see particularly p. 67, bottom, and cf. p. 42, bottom); but several exceptions occur: *brēost* (p. 17); *dēor* (p. 19); *stēop* (p. 25); *ēoh*, *ēōh* (p. 40); *dēaf* (p. 41). With regard to *scēawian*, *ēow*, *cnēow* (p. 42), I am in doubt, though probably the macron is meant for only the first vowel-sign. See also *heah*, without the macron (p. 40); *Eād-mund* (p. 14). Such discrepancies would be likely to puzzle a beginner; their occurrence is the more surprising because of the statement (p. iii): 'In preparing the manuscript for publication and in reading proof I have got much help of every sort from Assistant Professor C. S. Northup and Dr. B. S. Monroe.'

Before leaving the matter of proof-reading, I may be permitted to refer to the difficult matter of securing consistency in the hyphenation of compounds. Here, for example, we have 'vowel-lengthening' (p. 6) and 'vowel-shortening' (p. 13), 'vowel-quality' (p. 33), 'stop-*g*' (p. 75), but 'vowel quantity' (p. 10), 'vowel quality' (p. 22), 'vowel changes' (p. 45), 'vowel crasis' (p. 12), 'stop *g*' (p. 74). So 'noun-suffix' (p. 20), but 'adjective suffix' (p. 21). Other questionable forms are: 'Consonant groups' (p. 6), 'consonant changes' (p. 49), 'consonant system' (p. 49), 'consonant combinations' (p. 15), 'stem vowels' (p. 20), 'stem syllable' (p. 6), 'dialect form(s)' (pp. 7, 23); cf. 'rime-couplet' (p. 12), 'word-couplets' (p. 51), '*ch*, *j* sound' (p. 53). Since the publication of the *Standard Dictionary*, and Mr. F. H. Teall's work on this subject, greater consistency in the hyphenation of words is more practicable.

The punctuation leaves something less, if not something more, to be desired. In such tables as that on p. 14, one hardly sees the use of the periods (cf. pp. 11, 46, where they prove quite unnecessary). On p. 74, in the headings '1).', etc., either the) or the period is superfluous, and the preceding paragraph might end with a colon (so pp. 42, 43, 45, 64). On p. 16, more numerals seem necessary after 2, if each consonant-combination is to be separately treated.

Perhaps the 'guttural' of 'guttural vowels' (p. 64) needs a word of explanation. The *-ly* of p. 63 ought hardly to be derived from OE. *-lice*, without a reference to Old Norse influence.

All due allowance being made for these trifles, the value of the book is not seriously impaired by them. They are easily corrected, and the student will not be led seriously astray by a failure to correct them. The book ought to be of real service in diffusing sound knowledge of the relation of modern English pronunciation to that of our earlier speech. It should be welcome alike where more voluminous books dealing with the subject have penetrated, and where they have not. Its value is materially increased by the index of words, covering 15 pages.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

Hernani par VICTOR HUGO, with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary by JAMES D. BRUNER, PH. D., Associate Professor of the Romance Languages in the University of North Carolina. New York: American Book Co., 1906. 12mo., cloth, pp. 264, price 60c.

Two English editions and four American editions of Victor Hugo's *Hernani* attest the popularity of this standard play for school purposes. This verdict is amply justified by reasons that are, each alone, wellnigh quite sufficient to warrant an edition of the masterpiece. The intensely interesting human nature of the piece, its artistic literary construction, its exemplification of the principles of the Romantic school, the straightforward style and freedom from unusual difficulties of expression, the high rank of the play itself as well as that of the author, each in itself, but especially all collectively justify the numerous editions the play is likely to have long into the future.

The first edition annotated for school purposes in America appears to be that of Miss Rena Michaels (Holt & Co., 1886). This edition is noted in the first number of *M. L. N.*, 1886, p. 27, col. 54. Its principal claim to school recognition in those early days of the rise of the study of modern languages was its availability. The

need of a school text more adequate in every respect was plainly felt; for two good school editions, both copyrighted in 1891, appeared, the first edited by Prof. J. E. Matzke (Heath & Co.), the second by Prof. G. M. Harper. To what an extent, then, Prof. Bruner's edition fills a lacuna depends upon the teacher's idea of what a text-book should be, or upon what a teacher most desires to find emphasized in a school edition.

As the English editions, the Hachette, edited by Gustave Masson, and reprinted in this country by Jenkins, New York, and the Rivington, edited by Mr. H. A. Perry, appeared before the American editions, the task of annotation ought now to be reduced to the minimum of difficulty. Indeed, Prof. Harper, the editor of the Holt edition, acknowledges this fact in his Preface, saying: "It would be unfair to Dr. Matzke in particular not to pay tribute to the completeness of his notes which leave his successor little chance for originality." Incidentally this simplifies the task of the reviewer, for the statement may be conscientiously made once for all that the four American editions, including the Scott Foresman edition which appeared in 1900, edited by Prof. J. R. Effinger, Jr., as regards the text are adequately and even thoroughly annotated.

Prof. Bruner's edition is the only one which has a vocabulary. The text-book forming one of a series, the vocabulary is made in accordance with the system of the American Book Co., which is to relegate to the vocabulary difficulties of idiom, explaining peculiarities of construction in the notes, paraphrasing, but as a rule, not giving any translations. While this method, on the one hand, puts a check upon offering too many translations, on the other, it prevents oftentimes giving just what a note should give and which properly can hardly be put into the vocabulary. A play like *Hernani* is apt to be better adapted to third year students than to those who have had less experience with the language. For third year students a vocabulary in general is a luxury, not a necessity. In Prof. Bruner's edition most of the lexical difficulties, some of which in the other editions may be considered worthy of a note, are made clear in the vocabulary. This leaves the field free for the editor to make the notes serve his particular purpose. In the present case, this pur-